Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/776,820	STARR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Shane Bomar	3672
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n: <u>Allowed</u>
(1) Shane Bomar.	(3)	
(2) Melody Wirz	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 February 2007	Time: <u>12pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	oplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 1, 28, 29, and 32		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separ did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide rate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
		·
	•	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Attorney Wirz in response to the amendments made to the independent claims. It was suggested that the preconfigured segments or divisions needed to be tied into the event of fracturing and disposing of the tool. It was agreed to remove the word "fractures" from claim 1 and replace it with --is purposely fractured along the preconfigured divisions-- to tie the two concepts together. It was agreed to amend the remaining independent claims accordingly, with minor modifications made according to the individual claim. All changes were agreed to be made via Examiner's Amendment.